

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-21 are pending in the present application, Claims 11 and 20 having been amended, and Claim 21 having been added. Support for the present amendment is found, for example, in Applicants' Figs. 1-3. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 11-15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brodsky et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,489,985, hereinafter "Brodsky") in view of Tomita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,369,493, hereinafter "Tomita"); and Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita and further in view of Chiba et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20010014543, hereinafter "Chiba").

With regard to the rejection of Claim 11 as unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita, it is respectfully submitted that the present amendment overcomes this ground of rejection. Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "the first wide field camera, the second narrow field camera, and the laser source are disposed to use partly a same optical path." Brodsky and Tomita, taken alone or in proper combination, do not disclose or suggest at least this feature of amended Claim 11.

Page 3 of the outstanding Office Action concedes that Brodsky does not teach or suggest "a first wide field camera" and "a second narrow field camera." Thus, Brodsky does not disclose or suggest the claimed "the first wide field camera, the second narrow field camera, and the laser source are disposed to use partly a same optical path."

The outstanding Office Action relies on Tomita to describe a wide field camera and a narrow field camera. However, Tomita does not include a laser source. Rather, Tomita is

directed toward an apparatus that transports an electronic component. While Figs. 11-14 of Tomita describe an apparatus that includes two cameras,¹ there is no embodiment in Tomita that includes the claimed “the first wide field camera, the second narrow field camera, and the laser source are disposed to use partly a same optical path.”

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Tomita and Brodsky to add the two cameras of Tomita to the apparatus of Brodsky in such a manner that the two cameras of Tomita partially share an optical axis with the laser source of Brodsky.

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 11 (and Claims 12-19 and 21 dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Brodsky and Tomita, taken alone or in proper combination. Claim 20, although of a different statutory class, recite elements analogous to those of Claim 11. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 20 patentably distinguishes over Brodsky and Tomita, taken alone or in proper combination, for at least the reasons stated for Claim 11.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 16 as unpatentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita it further in view of Chiba, it is noted that Claim 16 is dependent from Claim 11, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Chiba does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Brodsky and Tomita. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 16 is patentable over Brodsky in view of Tomita it further in view of Chiba.


¹ Tomita, col. 8, lines 1-2, for example.

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
I:\ATTY\JWM\26s-29s\263673us\263673us_AM DUE 4-28-09.DOC

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796